



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/263,311	03/08/1999	JOHN J. KORMAN		1666
32127	7590	12/23/2003	EXAMINER	
VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC. C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN 600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE MAILCODE HQEO3H14 IRVING, TX 75038			SINGH, RAMNANDAN P	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2644		
DATE MAILED: 12/23/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/263,311	KORMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dr. Ramnandan Singh	2644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)      4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)      5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_      6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 26 September 2003 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. As new grounds of rejection are made, the indicated allowability of Claims 3-24 is withdrawn.

2. **Status of Claims**

Claims 1, 3, 11 are amended.

Claim 2 is cancelled.

Claims 1, 3-24 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bruhnke et al [US 6,477,248 B1].

Regarding Claim 1, Bruhnke et al teaches a telecommunication terminal block (or an interface device) shown in Fig. 5 for connecting a customer with any of a plurality of telecommunication service providers (i.e. line access modules), the terminal block includes a switching network to selectively connect at least one of the service providers to at least one of the customers (i.e. station access modules). Fig. 7 illustrates making a selective connection through physical disruption of at least one of the plurality of connection mechanisms, wherein the physical disruption occurs through operating one or more of relays 230, 235 and 240. It may, further, be noted that this physical disruption of the connection takes place without inserting or removing wires [Figs. 5-7; col. 3, lines 9-17; col. 5, lines 57-65; col. 7, lines 41-58].

Claim 4 is essentially similar to Claim 1, wherein Fig. 7 of Bruhnke et al illustrates all the limitations of Claim 4 [col. 7, lines 41-58].

Regarding Claim 5, see Fig. 7 of Bruhnke et al.

5. Claims 1, 3-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stehlin et al [US 6,307,933 B1].

Regarding Claim 1, Stehlin et al teaches an apparatus and method for providing a plurality of providers of subscriber service signals with easy access to at least one

subscriber premises line. The apparatus includes a plurality of connectors for being connected to at least one subscriber premises line and to incoming service lines from at least two service providers of subscriber service signals and which connectors permit **either** provider to disconnect from the subscriber premises line, the incoming service line of the other provider and thereafter connect its incoming service line to the subscriber premises line. Figs. 7 and 8 illustrates the connection mechanism. It may, further, be noted that this physical disruption of the connection takes place without inserting or removing wires [col. 2, lines 42-52; col. 7, lines 17 to col. 8 line 17; col. 11, lines 10-56; Fig. 17; col. 21 , lines 44-53; col. 1, lines 28-55; Abstract].

Claim 3 is essentially similar to Claim 1 except for including one or more insulating plugs insertable into at least one of the normally-closed contacts. Stehlin et al discloses a terminal block shown in Figs. 7-8 that includes an insulating block 72 providing a plurality of pairs of telephone terminals 7, and applies the state of art, as discussed herein, to connect or disconnect the service providers by plugging or unplugging the terminal block [Figs. 7-8, 11, 13-14, 17-8; col. 2, lines 42-52; col. 7, line 3 to col. 8, line 17].

Regarding Claims 4-5, Stehlin et al teaches an apparatus for connecting a customer with any of a plurality of telecommunication service providers that includes a first connector, a second connector, a third connector and a fourth connector [Figs. 7-8, 11, 13-14, 17-8; col. 27, lines 12-67].

Claim 6 is essentially similar to Claim 3 and is rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding Claims 7-9, Stehlin et al teaches the “telephone lines,” as known to those skilled in the art, typically comprises a pair of copper or copper alloy conductors sometimes referred to as a twisted pair or twisted pair of copper or copper alloy conductors [col. 1, line 58 to col. 2, line 17]. The other limitations are shown above.

Regarding Claims 10-11, Stehlin et al teaches providing a local loop to a customer premises by using an ancillary equipment, such as a television set [col. 25, line 59 to col. 26, line 21].

Regarding Claims 13-17, Stehlin et al teaches a telecommunications terminal block for connecting to either a first incoming service line from a first service provider or a second service line from a second service provider [Figs. 7-8, 17; col. 27, line 12 to col. 40, line 18].

Claims 18-21 are essentially similar to Claims 10-11.

Regarding Claim 22, the limitations are shown above.

Claims 12, 23-24 are essentially similar to Claim 3 and are rejected for the reasons stated above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruhnke et al [US 6,477,248 B1] in view of Randall, Jr. et al [US 4,734,061].

Regarding Claim 3, Bruhnke et al teaches a telecommunication terminal block (or an interface device) shown in Fig. 5 for connecting a customer with any of a plurality of telecommunication service providers (i.e. line access modules), the terminal block includes a switching network to selectively connect at least one of the service providers to at least one of the customers (i.e. station access modules). Fig. 7 illustrates making a selective connection through physical disruption of at least one of the plurality of connection mechanisms, wherein the physical disruption occurs through operating one or more of relays 230, 235 and 240. As shown in Fig. 7, the first service provider is CO LINE 1, 121a, and the second service provider CO LINE 2, 121b. It may, further, be noted that this physical disruption of the connection takes place without inserting or removing wires [Figs. 5-7; col. 3, lines 9-17; col. 5, lines 57-65; col. 7, lines 41-58].

Bruhnke et al applies relays as disabling mechanisms. Bruhnke et al , however, does not teach expressly using one or more insulating plugs as disabling mechanisms. It may, further, be noted that the use of insulating plugs as disabling mechanism is well-known in the art.

Randall, Jr. et al uses an insulating plug as a disabling mechanism [ Figs. 1, 3, 5; col. 2, lines 3-13].

Bruhnke et al and Randall, Jr. et al are analogous art because they are from a similar problem solving area, viz. , telecommunications terminal blocks.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply insulating plugs to disable service providers of Randall, Jr. et al with Bruhnke et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the corrosion of, and subsequent shorting between , service wire pair terminations by electrically and physically isolating such terminations from each other, from other terminations in the block, and from the environment [Randall, Jr. et al; col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 2].

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruhnke et al as applied to Claim 5 above, and further, in view of Randall, Jr. et al [US 4,734,061].

Regarding Claim 6, Bruhnke et al applies relays as disabling mechanisms.

Bruhnke et al , however, does not teach expressly using one or more insulating plugs as disabling mechanisms. It may, further, be noted that the use of insulating plugs as disabling mechanism is well-known in the art.

Randall, Jr. et al uses an insulating plug as a disabling mechanism [ Figs. 1, 3, 5; col. 2, lines 3-13].

Bruhnke et al and Randall, Jr. et al are analogous art because they are from a similar problem solving area, viz. , telecommunications terminal blocks.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply insulating plugs to disable service providers of Randall, Jr. et al with Bruhnke et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the corrosion of, and subsequent shorting between , service wire pair terminations by electrically and

physically isolating such terminations from each other, from other terminations in the block, and from the environment [Randall, Jr. et al; col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 2].

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- (i) Graham et al [US 5,297,199] teaches an apparatus for connecting and disconnecting subscriber premises line and incoming telephone company line [Abstract]; and
- (ii) Collins et al [US 979,209] a telephone network interface apparatus [Figs. 1-8; Abstract].

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Ramnandan Singh whose telephone number is (703)308-6270. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester Isen can be reached on (703)-305-4386. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9314 for regular communications and (703)872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)306-0377.

Dr. Ramnandan Singh  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2644



December 8, 2003



FORRESTER W. ISEN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600